

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 9, and 13 are amended. Claims 1-18, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

The Rejections:

In the Office Action dated September 2, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Conte (6,357,575).

As applied to Claims 1 and 9, the Examiner stated that Conte discloses a wire or cable processing device comprising: at least one swivel-arm feeder for feeding the cable to the processing stations comprising: a swivel-arm 14 having one end mounted for swiveling movement and linear movement a gripper 4 or 5 mounted on an opposite end of said swivel-arm capable of gripping and releasing a cable-end; and an actuator 23 or 28 arranged on said swivel-arm 14 and being connected to actuate said gripper 23 or 28 (see Figs.1-4, and the discussed at col. 2, lines 52- 67, etc.,).

The Examiner stated that the limitations of Claims 2, 7-8, 10 and 11 are also met by Conte (see Fig. 2, shows that the actuator is mounted on the swivel arm 19 and between the two ends).

Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Viviroli et al (6,886,438).

The Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 15, as understood, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conte or Viviroli et al in view of Tega et al (4,733,457).

It appears to the Examiner that Conte or Viviroli et al does not teach the configurations where the actuator is being mounted through an interior of the swivel arm. The Examiner stated that Tega et al teach the above feature (see Fig. 1). Therefore, according to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the Tega's teaching of the actuator being connected through an interior of the swivel arm onto the invention of Conte/Viviroli et al in order to form a desired structure having the configuration as described above.

The Examiner stated that, furthermore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to choose any desired location of the actuator including the described above since

000132702\0102\662770-1

applicant has not disclosed that the actuator being connected through an interior of the swivel arm is critical, patentably distinguishing features and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the configuration as taught by each of the prior art references

According to the Examiner, the limitation of Claim 15 is also met as the above discussion.

The Examiner allowed Claims 16-18 "for reasons from prior Office letter."

The Examiner objected to Claims 3-5 and 12-14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Cited References:

Conte shows a second drive unit 3 rotatably mounted on a platform 7. The second drive unit 3 has a bracket 11, carried by the platform 7, with cylinders 12, 13 and a third arm 14 of the bracket 11. Grippers 4, 5 are mounted at the third arm 14 and are rotated by the cylinders 12, 13 respectively through piston rods 23, 24 respectively. The gripper 4 is mounted on a first arm 15 that is rotatably mounted on the third arm 14 and the gripper 5 is mounted on a second arm 18 that is rotatably mounted on the third arm 14. A third drive unit 2.1 displaces the second drive unit 3 along an axis 10.

Tega et al. shows a mechanical hand 140 attached to a head 128 of a robot arm, the head comprising a main block 142 and a fitting block 144. The hand 140 is actuated by a hydraulic cylinder 170 and a piston 172 in the main block 142. Thus, the actuator is attached directly to the hand 140.

Applicant's Response:

Applicant notes that the Viviroli patent is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). The Viviroli filing date for 102(e) purposes is November 13, 2003 which is subsequent to Applicant's February 17, 2003 effective filing date. Therefore, the rejections of the claims based upon Viviroli are moot.

It is assumed that the Examiner meant to reject Claims 1, 2 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), not 102(e), as being anticipated by Conte since the Conte patent issued prior to Applicant's February 17, 2003 effective filing date.

Applicants amended Claims 1 and 9 to further define the actuator as "being connected to actuate said gripper to open and close gripper-jaws of said gripper". The grippers 4, 5 shown in Figs. 1-8 of Conte have no jaws and instead utilize guide tubes 4.1, 5.1 (Fig. 6) respectively that passively retain the cable ends 25, 26 respectively. The grippers 4, 5 shown in Fig. 9 of Conte have gripper jaws 4.2, 5.2 respectively that open and close. However, the jaws 4.2, 5.2 are not actuated by the cylinders 12, 13 and the piston rods 23, 24 that merely rotate the grippers 4, 5 relative to the third arm 14. Although not stated by Conte, the gripper jaws 4.2, 5.2 shown in Fig. 9 appear to be actuated by a pressure medium source since each of the grippers 4, 5 has added thereto what appear to be two pressure medium couplers.

Accordingly, the cited references do not show or suggest the invention defined by amended Claims 1-15

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner cited the U.S. Patent No. 5,305,508 issued to Koch et al. Applicant reviewed this reference and found it to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in the rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.